United States District Court Southern District of Texas

## **ENTERED**

October 27, 2023
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

| AMY DICKERSON,                   | § |                                |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Plaintiff,                       | § |                                |
| v.                               | § | CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:19-CV-03086 |
| UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS MD ANDERSON, | § |                                |
| Defendant.                       | § |                                |

## **ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

Plaintiff Amy Dickerson initiated this civil case on August 16, 2019, against University of Texas MD Anderson. This case has been pending for over four years and service has never been effectuated on the Defendant. The Court entered an order to Show Cause why this case should not be dismissed on August 9, 2022, and counsel for Plaintiff, Ellen Sprovach, responded she would serve the Defendant within 14 days of her response on August 31, 2022. Over a year later, service has still not been effectuated.

A district court has the inherent authority to dismiss *sua sponte* a case for want of prosecution. FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b); *Link v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–33 (1962). This power is necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases. *See Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board*, 704 F.2d 206, 214 (5th Cir. 1983); *Hejl v. State of Texas*, 664 F.2d 1273, 1274–75 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 456 U.S. 933 (1982).

Plaintiff Amy Dickerson failed to properly serve the Defendant under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4. Therefore, the Court hereby dismisses this action without prejudice for want of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

SIGNED this 27th day of October 2023.

Andrew S. Hanen United States District Judge